

**REMARKS**

Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 14-20 have been cancelled and new claims 21-25 have been submitted to overcome this rejection. Claims 14-20 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Duffin (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,976).


The basis for rejection of the previous claims base on Duffin was the purported disclosure of use of a Telnet protocol between a programmer and a remote station. However, nowhere does the office action identify where in Duffin a Telnet protocol is disclosed. Further, Applicant submits that absent from Duffin is any disclosure or suggestion of using a communications protocol that emulates a client/server model wherein the programmer runs dedicated software to access the remote data center such that commands entered on the programmer are executed as if entered directly on the remote data center.

Applicant submits that new claims 21-25 are in form and condition for allowance and requests that a notice of allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

KURT R. LINBERG

4/28/04  
Date

  
Daniel G. Chapik  
Reg. No. 43,424  
(763) 514-3066  
Customer No. 27581